arXiv:1210.2468v1 [math.AP] 9 Oct 2012

REGULARITY CRITERIA AND UNIFORM ESTIMATES FOR THE BOUSSINESQ SYSTEM WITH THE TEMPERATURE-DEPENDENT VISCOSITY AND THERMAL DIFFUSIVITY

JISHAN FAN, FUCAI LI*, AND GEN NAKAMURA

Abstract. In this paper we establish some regularity criteria for the 3D Boussinesq system with the temperature-dependent viscosity and thermal diffusivity. We also obtain some uniform estimates for the corresponding 2D case when the fluid viscosity coefficient is a positive constant.

1. Introduction

In this paper we establish some regularity criteria for the 3D Boussinesq system with the temperature-dependent viscosity and thermal diffusivity ([14, 33]):

$$\partial_t u + u\cdot\nabla u + \nabla\pi - \operatorname{div}(\mu(\theta)(\nabla u + \nabla u^{\mathrm{T}})) = \theta e_3, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\operatorname{div} u = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\partial_t \theta + u\cdot\nabla\theta - \operatorname{div}(\kappa(\theta)\nabla\theta) = 0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$(u,\theta)(x,0) = (u_0,\theta_0)(x), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^3. \tag{1.4}$$

Here the unknows u, π and θ denote the velocity, pressure and the temperature of the fluid, respectively. $e_3 := (0,0,1)^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the unit vector in the vertical x_3-direction. The kinematic viscosity $\mu(\theta)$ and the thermal conductivity $\kappa(\theta)$ are generally depending on the temperature θ. Throughout this paper, we assume that $\mu(\theta)$ and $\kappa(\theta)$ are smooth functions and satisfy

$$0 < C_1^{-1} \le \mu(\theta), \kappa(\theta) \le C_1 < \infty \quad \text{when} \quad |\theta| \le C_2 \tag{1.5}$$

for some positive constant $C_1 > 1$ and $C_2 > 0$. Boussinseq type system (1.1)-(1.3) are used to model geophysical flows such as atmospheric fronts and ocean circulations (see [31, 35]).

Date: October 10, 2012.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35Q30, 76D03, 76D09.

Key words and phrases. Regularity criterion, uniform regularity estimates, Boussinesq system,temperature-dependent viscosity, thermal diffusivity.

*Corresponding author.

There are many important progress on the Boussinseq system when both $\kappa(\theta)$ and $\mu(\theta)$ are independent of θ, see [2–4, 6–11, 15, 16, 19–22, 24, 27, 28, 32] and the references cited therein. When $\kappa(\theta)$ and $\mu(\theta)$ depend on θ, only a few results are aviable, see [1, 12, 13, 29, 30, 37]. In [29, 30], Lorca and Boldrini proved that the global existence of weak solution with small initial data and the local existence of strong solution for general data to the problem (1.1)-(1.4), see also [12, 13]. In [1], Abidi obtained the global existence and uniqueness result to the problem (1.1)-(1.3) with $k = 0$ in some critical spaces when the initial temperature is small. Recently, Wang and Zhang [37] obtain the global existence of smooth solutions to the problem (1.1)-(1.4) with general initial date in two-dimensional case. However, whether or not the smooth solution to the 3D boussinesq system (1.1)-(1.3) with general initial data blows up in finite time is still a big open problem. In this paper we provide some regularity criteria related to this topic. We will prove

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\kappa(\theta) \equiv 1$ and $\mu(\theta)$ satisfy (1.5) and $u_0, \theta_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Suppose that there exists a $T > 0$ such that one of the following two conditions holds:*

$$u \in L^p(0,T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)) \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} = 1, \ 3 < q \le \infty, \tag{1.6}$$

$$\nabla u \in L^p(0,T; L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)) \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{2}{p} + \frac{3}{q} = 2, \ 3/2 < q \le \infty. \tag{1.7}$$

Then the solution (u, θ) of the problem (1.1)-(1.4) satisfies

$$u, \theta \in L^\infty(0,T; H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^3(\mathbb{R}^3)). \tag{1.8}$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mu(\theta)$ and $\kappa(\theta)$ satisfy (1.5). Let $u_0, \theta_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Assume that (1.6) holds with $3 < q < \infty$, then the solution (u, θ) of the problem (1.1)-(1.4) satisfies (1.8).*

Remark 1.1. *We can obtain the regularity criteria (1.6) or (1.7) for the Cahn-Hilliard-Navier-Stokes system [18, 23]:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \pi - \nabla \cdot \mu(\phi)(\nabla u + \nabla u^{\mathrm{T}}) = \eta \nabla \phi, \\
&\operatorname{div} u = 0, \\
&\partial_t \phi + u \cdot \nabla \phi - \Delta \eta = 0, \\
&\eta = -\Delta \phi + f'(\phi), \ f(\phi) = \frac{1}{4}(\phi^2 - 1)^2, \\
&(u, \phi)(x, 0) = (u_0, \phi_0)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the proof is similar to Theorem 1.1, we omit the details here.

To prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, it suffices to obtain a priori estimates under the conditions (1.6) or (1.7). Since the equations (1.1) and (1.3) are strongly coupled, it is difficult to obtain the L^p estimates of $\nabla\theta$ and the Hölder continuity of θ, we shall use the results in [5, 37], Sobolev imbedding, and the ingenious applications of Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities to overcome it.

Next, we consider the Boussinesq system (1.1)-(1.3) in two-dimensional spatial space $\mathbb{R}^2$ and let the kinematic viscosity $\mu(\theta)$ be a positive constant, i.e, $\mu(\theta) \equiv \epsilon > 0$. In this case the system reads

$$\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \pi - \epsilon \Delta u = \theta e_2, \tag{1.9}$$

$$\operatorname{div} u = 0, \tag{1.10}$$

$$\partial_t \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta - \operatorname{div}(\kappa(\theta)\nabla\theta) = 0, \tag{1.11}$$

$$(u,\theta)(x,0) = (u_0,\theta_0)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{1.12}$$

Here $e_2 := (0,1)^{\mathrm{T}}$. As before, the thermal conductivity $\kappa(\theta)$ is assumed to be smooth and satisfy

$$0 < C_1^{-1} \le \kappa(\theta) \le C_1 < \infty \ \text{ when } \ |\theta| \le C_2 \tag{1.13}$$

for some positive constant $C_1 > 1$ and $C_2 > 0$.

Notice that in [37] Wang and Zhang have established the global existence of classical solutions for the problem (1.9)-(1.12) with general initial data and fixed $\epsilon > 0$. In this paper we give the uniform-in-ϵ estimates for smooth solutions to the problem (1.9)-(1.12). Our result reads

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\kappa(\theta)$ satisfy (1.13) and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. Let $\theta_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $u_0 \in H^3(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then for any given $T > 0$, the solution (u,θ) to the problem* (1.9)-(1.12) *satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C, \tag{1.14}$$

where C is a positive constant independent of ϵ.

Finally, considering the following 2D Boussinesq system

$$\partial_t u + u \cdot \nabla u + \nabla \pi - \Delta u = \theta e_2, \tag{1.15}$$

$$\operatorname{div} u = 0, \tag{1.16}$$

$$\partial_t \theta + u \cdot \nabla \theta - \epsilon \operatorname{div}(\kappa(\theta)\nabla\theta) = 0, \tag{1.17}$$

$$(u,\theta)(x,0) = (u_0,\theta_0)(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.18}$$

we can obtain a similar result on uniform-in-ϵ estimates for smooth solutions to the problem (1.15)-(1.18).

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\kappa(\theta)$ satisfy (1.13) and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. Let $u_0, \theta_0 \in H^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\operatorname{div} u_0 = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then for any given $T > 0$, the solution (u, θ) to the problem* (1.15)-(1.18) *satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C, \tag{1.19}$$

where C is a positive constant independent of ϵ.

Remark 1.2. *In [7], Chae has proved similar results to Theorems 1.3 and 1.4 when $\kappa(\theta) \equiv 1$, it seems impossible to apply his method directly to our case. In fact, if we follow his arguments we shall encounter the unpleasant terms involved $\kappa(\theta)$ which are out of control.*

We give some comments on the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. Since the local-in-time well-posedness has been proved in [30], to complete our proofs, we only need to prove the*a priori* estimates (1.14) and (1.19). We shall employ an elaborate nonlinear energy method to obtain these desired bounds. More precisely, we first use the maximum principle to obtain the L^∞ estimates of θ. Next, we derive an energy estimate based on the L^2 energy. Finally, we use Amann's L^p estimates on the uniform parabolic equations, the Sobolev imbedding, bilinear commutator estimates, logarithmic Sobolev inequality, and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities to obtain the desired higher order spatial estimates on θ and u.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some notations and recall some basic inequalities. Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 are presented in the subsequent four sections.

2. Preliminary

In this section, we recall some basic inequalities which shall be used frequently.

Lemma 2.1 (Logarithmic Sobolev inequality [26])**.** *For all $u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $s > 1 + d/2$, there exists a constant C such that the following estimate holds*

$$\|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty} \le C(1 + \|\operatorname{div} v\|_{L^\infty} + \|\operatorname{curl} v\|_{L^\infty})(1 + \log(e + \|v\|_{H^s})). \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 2.2 (Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality [17,34])**.** *Let $v \in W^{k,r}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $1 \le q, r \le \infty$. Then the following inequalities hold*

$$\|D^i v\|_{L^p} \le M_0 \|D^k v\|_{L^r}^{\alpha} \|v\|_{L^q}^{1-\alpha}, \quad \forall\ 0 \le i < k, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{i}{N} + \alpha\Big(\frac{1}{r} - \frac{k}{d}\Big) + (1-\alpha)\frac{1}{q},$$

for all α in the interval

$$\frac{i}{k} \leq \alpha \leq 1.$$

The constant M_0 depending only on d, m, j, q, r and α, with the following exceptional case:

1. *If $i = 0$, $rk < d, q = \infty$ then we make the additional assumption that either v tends to zero at infinity or $v \in L^{\tilde{q}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for some finite $\tilde{q} > 0$.*
2. *If $1 < r < \infty$, and $k - i - d/r$ is a non negative integer then (2.2) holds only for α satisfying $i/k \leq \alpha < 1$.*

We define the operator $\Lambda := (-\Delta)^{1/2}$ via the Fourier transform

$$\widehat{\Lambda f}(\xi) = |\xi|\hat{f}(\xi).$$

Generally, we define $\Lambda^s f$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\widehat{\Lambda^s f}(\xi) = |\xi|^s \hat{f}(\xi).$$

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} := \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^2} = \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\xi|^{2s} |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 \, d\xi \Big)^{1/2}$$

and the homogeneous Sobolev space $\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}^3) := \{f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^3) : \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} < \infty\}$. Similar, the Sobolev space $H^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is equipped with the norm

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s,p}} := \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^p}.$$

Now we recall the following bilinear commutator and the product estimates.

Lemma 2.3 ([25]). *Let $s > 0, 1 < p < \infty$. Assume that $f, g \in \dot{H}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then there exists a constant C, independent of f and g, such that,*

$$\|\Lambda^s(fg) - f\Lambda^s g\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|\nabla f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Lambda^{s-1} g\|_{L^{q_1}} + \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_2}} \|g\|_{L^{q_2}}), \tag{2.3}$$

$$\|\Lambda^s(fg)\|_{L^p} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^{p_1}} \|\Lambda^s g\|_{L^{q_1}} + \|\Lambda^s f\|_{L^{p_2}} \|g\|_{L^{q_2}}), \tag{2.4}$$

where $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty]$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{q_1} = \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{q_2}.$$

Lemma 2.4 ([36]). *Let $s > 0, 1 < p < \infty$, and $f \in \dot{H}^{s,p}(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Assume that $F(\cdot)$ is a smooth function on $\mathbb{R}$ with $F(0) = 0$. Then we have*

$$\|F(f)\|_{\dot{H}^{s,p}} \leq C(M)(1 + \|f\|_{L^\infty})^{[s]+1} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s,p}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where the constant $C(M)$ depends on $M := \sup_{k \leq [s]+2, |t| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}} \|F^{(k)}(t)\|_{L^\infty}$.

In the subsequent sections, we use C (independent of ϵ in Sections 5 and 6) to denote the positive constant which may change from line to line. We also omit the spatial domain $\mathbb{R}^3$ or $\mathbb{R}^2$ in the integrals below for simplicity.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

First, it follows from the maximum principle and (1.3) and (1.4) that

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))} \le \|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \le C. \tag{3.1}$$

Multiplying (1.3) by θ, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), we see that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int \theta^2 dx + \int |\nabla\theta|^2 dx = 0,$$

which gives

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))} \le C. \tag{3.2}$$

Multiplying (1.1) by u, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (3.1), (3.2) and (1.5), we find that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int u^2 dx + \frac{1}{C}\int |\nabla u|^2 dx \le \int \theta e_3 \cdot u dx \le \|u\|_{L^2}\|\theta\|_{L^2} \le C\|u\|_{L^2},$$

which implies

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))} \le C. \tag{3.3}$$

(I). *Assume (1.6) holds.*

Applying the operator ∂_i to (1.3), multiplying the result by $(\partial_i\theta)^3$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^3$, summing over i, and using (1.2), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla\theta|^4 dx + \frac{3}{4}\int |\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2|^2 dx \le C\int |u||\nabla\theta|^2|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2| dx \\
\le& C\|u\|_{L^q}\||\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2} \\
\le& C\|u\|_{L^q}\||\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha_1}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^{1+\alpha_1} \\
\le& \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|u\|_{L^q}^p\||\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^2 \quad \left(p = \frac{2}{1-\alpha_1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence it holds

$$\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}^3))} \le C. \tag{3.4}$$

Multiplying (1.1) by $-\Delta u$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (3.4), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int |\nabla u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{C}\int |\Delta u|^2 dx \le \int (u\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta u dx + C\int |\nabla\theta||\nabla u||\Delta u| dx \\
\le& \|u\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq C\|u\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha_1}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^{1+\alpha_1}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{2C}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2+C\big\{\|u\|_{L^q}^p\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2\big\},$$

which gives

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))}+\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}\leq C. \tag{3.5}$$

Applying the operator Δ to (1.3), multiplying the result by $\Delta\theta$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (3.5), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Delta\theta|^2dx+\int|\nabla\Delta\theta|^2dx=\sum_i\int\partial_i(u\cdot\nabla\theta)\cdot\partial_i\Delta\theta dx$$
$$\leq(\|u\|_{L^6}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}$$
$$\leq C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}$$
$$\leq C\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{3/2}\leq\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which leads to

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}+\|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^3))}\leq C. \tag{3.6}$$

Applying the operator Δ to (1.1), multiplying the result by Δu, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (1.5), (3.1), (2.5), and (3.5), we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Delta u|^2dx+\frac{1}{C}\int|\nabla\Delta u|^2dx$$
$$\leq\sum_i\int\partial_i(u\cdot\nabla u)\cdot\partial_i\Delta u dx+C\int(|\Delta\mu(\theta)||\nabla u|+|\nabla\mu(\theta)||\nabla^2u|)|\nabla\Delta u|dx$$
$$\leq(\|u\|_{L^6}\|\Delta u\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2}$$
$$+C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}\|\nabla u\|_{L^6}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2})\|\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2}$$
$$\leq C(\|\Delta u\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2}$$
$$+C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2}$$
$$\leq\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2+C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}^2+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty}^2)\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2,$$

which implies

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}+\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^3))}\leq C. \tag{3.7}$$

Thus (1.8) holds.

(II). *Assume (1.7) holds.*

Applying the operator ∂_i to (1.3), multiplying the result by $(\partial_i\theta)^3$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^3$, summing over i, and using (1.2), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{4}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla\theta|^4dx+\frac{3}{4}\int|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2|^2dx\\
\leq&C\int|\nabla u||\nabla\theta|^2\cdot|\nabla\theta|^2dx\\
\leq&C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\||\nabla\theta|^2\|^2_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-1}}}\\
\leq&C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\||\nabla\theta|^2\|^{2(1-\alpha_2)}_{L^2}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|^{2\alpha_2}_{L^2}\\
\leq&\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|^2_{L^2}+C\|\nabla u\|^p_{L^q}\||\nabla\theta|^2\|^2_{L^2}\quad\left(p=\frac{1}{1-\alpha_2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.4).

Multiplying (1.1) by $-\Delta u$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (3.4), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla u|^2dx+\frac{1}{C}\int|\Delta u|^2dx\\
\leq&\sum_i\int u_i\partial_iu\partial_j^2udx+C\int|\nabla\theta||\nabla u||\Delta u|dx\\
\leq&-\sum_i\int\partial_ju_i\partial_iu\partial_judx+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}\\
\leq&C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-1}}}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}\\
\leq&C\|\nabla u\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|^{2(1-\alpha_2)}_{L^2}\|\Delta u\|^{2\alpha_2}_{L^2}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^4}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}\\
\leq&\frac{1}{2C}\|\Delta u\|^2_{L^2}+C\big\{\|\nabla u\|^p_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}+\|\nabla u\|^2_{L^2}\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.5).

Noticing that the calculations for (3.6) and (3.7) still hold in this case, we hence complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

First, by the maximum principle, it is easy to prove that

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))}\leq C. \tag{4.1}$$

Noticing the condition (1.5), we still have (3.2) and (3.3).

Similar to the Proposition 4.1 in [37], we can prove

Proposition 4.1. *Let u satisfy (1.6) and* $\operatorname{div}u=0$ *in $\mathbb{R}^3\times(0,\infty)$. Assume that $\theta\in L^\infty(0,T;L^2)\cap L^2(0,T;H^1)$ is a weak solution to (1.3) and (1.4). Then there exists a $\alpha\in(0,1)$ such that $\theta\in C^\alpha([0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^3)$.*

Proof. Most of the calculations are as same as that in [37], the only difference is the calculations of the following term

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\int \theta_k^2 u\cdot\nabla\eta\ \eta dxdt\right|\\
\le&\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\|u\|_{L^q}\|\eta\theta_k\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}}\|\theta_k\nabla\eta\|_{L^2}dt\\
\le&\int_{t_1}^{t_2}C\|u\|_{L^q}\|\eta\theta_k\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha_1}\|\nabla(\eta\theta_k)\|_{L^2}^{\alpha_1}\|\theta_k\nabla\eta\|_{L^2}dt\quad\left(p=\frac{2}{1-\alpha_1}\right)\\
\le&\epsilon\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\|u\|_{L^q}^2\|\eta\theta_k\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\alpha_1)}\|\nabla(\eta\theta_k)\|_{L^2}^{2\alpha_1}dt+C\|\theta_k\nabla\eta\|_{L^2(t_1,t_2;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2\\
\le&\epsilon\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\|u\|_{L^q}^p dt\|\eta\theta_k\|_{L^\infty(t_1,t_2;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2\\
&+C\epsilon\|\nabla(\eta\theta_k)\|_{L^2(t_1,t_2;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2+C\|\theta_k\nabla\eta\|_{L^2(t_1,t_2;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))}^2
\end{aligned}$$

for any $0<\epsilon<1$. □

Now, using an estimate of the gradient of the solution to the parabolic equation

$$\partial_t\theta-\mathrm{div}\,(\kappa(\theta)\nabla\theta)=-\mathrm{div}\,(u\theta),$$

we have (see [5])

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))}\le&C\|u\theta\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))}+C\\
\le&C\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty)}\|u\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))}+C\\
\le&C\|u\|_{L^p(0,T;L^q(\mathbb{R}^3))}+C.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

Multiplying (1.1) by $-\Delta u$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (4.2), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla u|^2dx+\frac{1}{C}\int|\Delta u|^2dx\\
\le&\int(u\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta udx+C\int|\nabla\theta||\nabla u||\Delta u|dx\\
\le&\|u\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}\\
\le&C(\|u\|_{L^q}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q})\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha_1}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^{1+\alpha_1}\\
\le&\frac{1}{2C}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2+C(\|u\|_{L^q}^p+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}^p)\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which gives (3.5).

Applying the operator Δ to (1.3), multiplying the result by $\Delta\theta$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^3$, and using (1.2), (3.5), (2.5), (4.2), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Delta\theta|^2dx+\frac{2}{C}\int|\nabla\Delta\theta|^2dx\\
\le&\sum_i\int\partial_i(u\cdot\nabla\theta)\cdot\partial_i\Delta\theta dx+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\
\le&(\|u\|_{L^6}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1-\alpha_1}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1+\alpha_1}\\
\le&C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^3}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}^p\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{1}{4C}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2\\
\le&\frac{1}{2C}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+C\big\{\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}^p\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies (3.6).

Noticing the calculations for (3.7) still hold here, we hence complete the proof of Theorem 1.2.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

To complete our proof of Theorem 1.3, we only need to prove a priori estimates (1.14). By the maximum principle, it follows from (1.11) and (1.12) that

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le\|\theta_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)}\le C. \tag{5.1}$$

Multiplying (1.11) by θ, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.10), (1.13), and (5.1), we see that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int\theta^2dx+\int\kappa(\theta)|\nabla\theta|^2dx=0,$$

which gives

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}+\|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{5.2}$$

Multiplying (1.9) by u, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.10) and (5.2), we find that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int u^2dx+\epsilon\int|\nabla u|^2dx=\int\theta e_2udx\le\|\theta\|_{L^2}\|u\|_{L^2}\le C\|u\|_{L^2},$$

which yields

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}+\sqrt{\epsilon}\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{5.3}$$

Multiplying (1.9) by $-\Delta u$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.10), (5.2) and the fact that

$$\int(u\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta udx=0,$$

we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla u|^2dx+\epsilon\int|\Delta u|^2dx\le\int|\nabla\theta||\nabla u|dx\le\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}\|\nabla u\|_{L^2},$$

which leads to

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))}+\sqrt{\epsilon}\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{5.4}$$

Then by the same calculations as that in [37], we have

$$\|\theta\|_{C^\alpha(\mathbb{R}^3\times[0,T])}\le C \tag{5.5}$$

for some $\alpha\in(0,1)$ independent of $\epsilon>0$.

Now, using an estimate of the gradient of the solution of the parabolic equation

$$\partial_t\theta-\operatorname{div}(\kappa(\theta)\nabla\theta)=-\operatorname{div}(u\theta),$$

we obtain (see [5])

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le& C+\|u\theta\|_{L^4(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}^2))}\\ \le& C+\|u\|_{L^4(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}^2))}\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C.\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Applying the operator Δ to (1.9), multiplying the result by $\Delta\theta$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.10), (5.4), the Hölder and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Delta\theta|^2dx+\frac{1}{C}\int|\nabla\Delta\theta|^2dx\\ \le&\sum_i\int\partial_i(u\cdot\nabla\theta)\partial_i\Delta\theta dx+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\ \le& C(\|u\|_{L^4}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^4}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^2}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\ \le& C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^4}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\ \le& C(\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2}+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}^{2/3}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/3})\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\ &+C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^{3/2}\\ \le&\frac{1}{2C}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+C\big\{\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}^2+\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}^4\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2\big\},\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}+\|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{5.7}$$

Here we have used the estimate (see (2.5)):

$$\|\Delta\kappa(\theta)\|_{L^p}\le C\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^p}\quad \textit{with}\ \ 1<p<\infty. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $\omega=\operatorname{curl}u=\partial_1u_2-\partial_2u_1$ for $u=(u_1,u_2)^{\mathrm{T}}$. Taking curl to (1.9) and using (1.10), we infer that

$$\partial_t\omega+u\cdot\nabla\omega-\epsilon\Delta\omega=\partial_1\theta. \tag{5.9}$$

Multiplying (5.9) by $|\omega|^{q-2}\omega$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.10) and (5.7), we have

$$\frac{1}{q}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\omega|^q dx \le \int \partial_1\theta|\omega|^{q-2}\omega dx \le \|\partial_1\theta\|_{L^q}\|\omega\|_{L^q}^{q-1}$$

which gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\omega\|_{L^q} \le C\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q},$$

and thus

$$\|\omega\|_{L^q} \le \|\omega_0\|_{L^q} + C\int_0^T \|\nabla\theta\|_{L^q}dx. \tag{5.10}$$

Taking $q\to+\infty$ in (5.10), we obtain

$$\|\omega\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C. \tag{5.11}$$

Applying the operator Λ^3 to (1.9), multiplying the result by $\Lambda^3 u$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.10), (5.7), (5.11), (2.3), and (2.1), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Lambda^3 u|^2dx \le& -\int(\Lambda^3(u\cdot\nabla u)-u\nabla\Lambda^3 u)\Lambda^3 u dx + \int \Lambda^3(\theta e_2)\cdot\Lambda^3 u dx\\ \le& C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\Lambda^3 u\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\Lambda^3\theta\|_{L^2}\|\Lambda^3 u\|_{L^2}\\ \le& C(1+\log(e+\|\Lambda^3 u\|_{L^2}))\|\Lambda^3 u\|_{L^2}^2 + C\|\Lambda^3\theta\|_{L^2}\|\Lambda^3 u\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C. \tag{5.12}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

6. Proof of Theorem 1.4

To complete our proof of Theorem 1.4, we only need to prove a priori estimates (1.19). First, the estimate (5.1) still holds. Similarly to (5.2) and (5.3), we have

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \sqrt{\epsilon}\|\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C. \tag{6.2}$$

Multiplying (1.15) by $-\Delta u$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.16), (6.1) and the fact that

$$\int(u\cdot\nabla)u\cdot\Delta u dx = 0,$$

we find that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla u|^2dx + \int|\Delta u|^2dx = -\int\theta e_2\Delta u dx \le \|\theta\|_{L^2}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2} \le C\|\Delta u\|_{L^2},$$

which implies

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))} + \|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))} \le C. \tag{6.3}$$

By the Sobolev embedding theorem, it is easy to find that

$$\partial_t u-\Delta u+\nabla\pi=f,\quad f:=\theta e_2-u\cdot\nabla u\in L^2(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)), \tag{6.4}$$

for any $p\in(2,\infty)$. Therefore, it follows from (6.4) and the regularity theory of Stokes equation that

$$\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C\|f\|_{L^2(0,T;L^p(\mathbb{R}^2))}+C\le C. \tag{6.5}$$

And thus

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^2(0,T;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;W^{2,p}(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{6.6}$$

Let

$$\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta):=\int_0^\theta\kappa(\xi)d\xi.$$

We deduce from (1.17) that

$$\partial_t\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)+u\cdot\nabla\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)-\epsilon\kappa(\theta)\Delta\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)=0. \tag{6.7}$$

Multiplying (6.7) by $-\Delta\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.16) and (6.6), we derive

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)|^2dx+\epsilon\int\kappa(\theta)|\Delta\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)|^2dx\\ =&\int u\nabla\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)\Delta\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)dx=-\int\sum_{i,j}\partial_ju_i\partial_i\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)\partial_j\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)dx\le\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)\|_{L^2}^2,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{R}^2))}+\sqrt{\epsilon}\|\Delta\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{6.8}$$

Noting that (see (2.5))

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\epsilon}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}=&\sqrt{\epsilon}\|\Delta(\widetilde{\kappa}^{-1}\circ\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta))\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}\\ \le&\sqrt{\epsilon}C\|\Delta\widetilde{\kappa}(\theta)\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C.\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, it follows from (6.8) and (6.9) that

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}^2))}^4=&\epsilon\int_0^T\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}^4dt\le C\epsilon\int_0^T\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^2}^2\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2dt\\ \le&C\epsilon\int_0^T\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2dt\le C.\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

Applying the operator ∂_i to (1.17) gives

$$\partial_t\partial_i\theta+u\nabla\partial_i\theta+\partial_iu\cdot\nabla\theta-\epsilon\text{div}\,\{\kappa(\theta)\nabla\partial_i\theta+k'(\theta)\partial_i\theta\nabla\theta\}=0. \tag{6.11}$$

Multiplying (6.11) by $(\partial_i\theta)^3$, integrating the result over $\mathbb{R}^2$, summing over i, and using (1.16), (6.6) and (6.10), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{4}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\nabla\theta|^4dx+\frac{\epsilon}{C}\int|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2|^2dx$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\le C\epsilon\int|\nabla\theta|\cdot|\nabla\theta|^2|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2|dx+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\int|\nabla\theta|^4dx\\
&\le C\epsilon\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|(\nabla\theta)^2\|_{L^4}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\int|\nabla\theta|^4dx\\
&\le C\epsilon\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\||\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\cdot\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^{3/2}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\int|\nabla\theta|^4dx\\
&\le\frac{\epsilon}{2C}\|\nabla|\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^2+C\epsilon\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}^4\||\nabla\theta|^2\|_{L^2}^2+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\int|\nabla\theta|^4dx,
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives

$$\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^4(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{6.12}$$

Applying the operator Δ to (1.17), multiplying the result by $\Delta\theta$, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (2.5), (6.12), (5.8), (6.5), and (6.6), we conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Delta\theta|^2dx+\frac{\epsilon}{C}\int|\nabla\Delta\theta|^2dx\\
\le&-\int(\Delta(u\cdot\nabla\theta)-u\nabla\Delta\theta)\Delta\theta dx+C\epsilon\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}\|\Delta k\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\
\le&C(\|\Delta u\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\theta\|_{L^4}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2})\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}+C\epsilon\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^4}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\\
\le&C(\|\Delta u\|_{L^4}+\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2})\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}+\frac{\epsilon}{2C}\|\nabla\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2+C\epsilon\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

which leads to

$$\|\theta\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C. \tag{6.13}$$

Finally, applying the operator Δ to (1.15), multiplying the result by Δu, integrating over $\mathbb{R}^2$, and using (1.16), (6.13), and (6.6), we arrive at

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int|\Delta u|^2dx+\int|\nabla\Delta u|^2dx\\
=&\int\Delta\theta e_2\cdot\Delta udx-\int\Delta(u\cdot\nabla u)\cdot\Delta udx\\
\le&\|\Delta\theta\|_{L^2}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2\\
\le&C\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}+C\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta u\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^2(\mathbb{R}^2))}+\|u\|_{L^2(0,T;H^3(\mathbb{R}^2))}\le C.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Acknowledgements: Fan was supported by NSFC (Grant No. 11171154). Li was supported by NSFC (Grant No. 11271184, 10971094), NCET-11-0227, PAPD, and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities.

References

[1] H. Abidi, Sur l'unicité pour le système de Boussinesq avec diffusion non linéaire, J. Math. Pures Appl. 91 (2009), 80-99.

[2] H. Abidi, T. Hmidi, On the global well-posedness for Boussinesq system, J. Differential Equations 233 (2007) 199-220.

[3] D. Adhikari, C. Cao, J. Wu, The 2D Boussinesq equations with vertical viscosity and vertical diffusivity, J. Differential Equations 249 (2010) 1078-1088.

[4] D. Adhikari, C. Cao, J. Wu, Global regularity results for the 2D Boussinesq equations with vertical dissipation, J. Differential Equations 251 (2011) 1637-1655.

[5] H. Amann, Linear and quasilinear parabolic problems. vol. I, volume 89 of Monographs in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1995.

[6] L. Brandolese, M. E. Schonbek, Large time decay and growth for solutions of a viscous Boussinesq system. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 364 (2012), no. 10, 5057-5090.

[7] D. Chae, Global regularity for the 2D Boussinesq equations with partial viscosity terms, Adv. Math. 203(2006) 497-513.

[8] D. Chae, H.-S. Nam, Local existence and blow-up criterion for the Boussinesq equations. Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 127 (1997), 935-946.

[9] D. Chae, J. Wu, The 2D Boussinesq equations with logarithmically supercritical velocities, Adv. Math. 230 (2012) 1618-1645.

[10] R. Danchin, M. Paicu, Global well-posedness issues for the inviscid Boussinesq system with Yudovichs type data, Comm. Math. Phys. 290 (2009) 1-14.

[11] R. Danchin, M. Paicu, Global existence results for the anisotropic Boussinesq system in dimension two, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. 21 (2011) 421-457.

[12] J.I. Diaz, G. Galliano, On the Boussinesq system with nonlinear thermal diffusion, Nonlinear Anal., 30 (6) (1997), 3255-3263.

[13] J.I. Diaz, G. Galiano, Existence and uniqueness of solutions of the Boussinesq system with nonlinear thermal diffusion, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal., 11 (1) (1998), 59-82.

[14] P. G. Drazin, W. H. Reid, Hydrodynamic Stability, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1981.

[15] J. Fan, G. Nakamura, H. Wang, Blow-up criteria of smooth solutions to the 3D Boussinesq system with zero viscosity in a bounded domain. Nonlinear Anal. 75 (2012), no. 7, 3436-3442.

[16] J. Fan, T. Ozawa, Regularity criteria for the 3D density-dependent Boussinesq equations. Nonlinearity 22 (2009), 553-568.

[17] E. Gagliardo, Proprietà di alcune classi di funzioni in più variabili. Ricerche di. Matem. 7(1958), 102-137.

[18] M. Grasselli, D. Prazak, Long time behavior of a diffuse interface model for binary fluid mixtures with shear dependent viscosity, Interfaces and Free Boundaries 13(2011) 507-530.

[19] T. Hmidi, S. Keraani, On the global well-posedness of the Boussinesq system with zero viscosity, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 58 (2009) 1591-1618.

[20] T. Hmidi, S. Keraani, F. Rousset, Global well-posedness for EulerCBoussinesq system with critical dissipation, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 36 (2011) 420-445.

[21] T. Hmidi, S. Keraani, F. Rousset, Global well-posedness for a Boussinesq-Navier-Stokes system with critical dissipation, J. Differential Equations 249 (2010) 2147-2174.

[22] T. Hmidi,F. Rousset, Global well-posedness for the Euler-Boussinesq system with axisymmetric data. J. Funct. Anal. 260 (2011), no. 3, 745-796.

[23] P. C. Hohenberg, B. I. Halperin, Theory of dynamical critical phenomena, Rev. Modern Phys. 49(1977) 435-479.

[24] T. Hou, C. Li, Global well-posedness of the viscous Boussinesq equations, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 12 (2005) 1-12.

[25] T. Kato, G. Ponce, Commutator estimates and the Euler and Navier-Stokes equations, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 41(1988) 891-907.

[26] H. Kozono, T. Ogawa, Y. Taniuchi, The critical Sobolev inequalities in Besov spaces and regularity criterion to some semi-linear evolution equations. Math. Z. 242(2002) 251-278.

[27] M.-J. Lai, R. Pan, K. Zhao, Initial boundary value problem for two-dimensional viscous Boussinesq equations. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 199 (2011), no. 3, 739-760.

[28] A. Larios, E. Lunasin, E.S. Titi, Global well-posedness for the 2D Boussinesq system without heat diffusion and with either anisotropic viscosity or inviscid Voigt-a regularization, 2010. arXiv:1010.5024v1 [math.AP].

[29] S. A. Lorca, J. L. Boldrini, The initial value problem for a generalized Boussinesq model: regularity and global existence of strong solutions. Mat. Contemp. 11 (1996), 71-94.

[30] S. A. Lorca, J. L. Boldrini, The initial value problem for a generalized Boussinesq model, Nonlinear Anal. 36(1999) 457-480.

[31] A.J. Majda, Introduction to PDEs and Waves for the Atmosphere and Ocean, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 9, AMS/CIMS, 2003.

[32] C. Miao, L. Xue, On the global well-posedness of a class of Boussinesq-Navier-Stokes systems, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 18 (6) (2011) 707-735.

[33] J. M. Milhaljan, A rigorous exposition of the Boussinesq approximations applicable to a thin layer of fluid, Astron. J. (3) 136 (1962) 1126-1133.

[34] L. Nirenberg, On elliptic partial differential equations, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) 13(1959) 115-162.

[35] J. Pedlosky, Geophysical Fluid Dyanmics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987.

[36] H. Triebel, Theory of function spaces, Monogr. Math., Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, Boston, 1983.

[37] C. Wang, Z. Zhang, Global well-posedness for the 2-D Boussinesq system with the temperature-dependent viscosity and thermal diffusivity, Adv. Math. 228 (2011) 43-62.

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS, NANJING FORESTRY UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210037, P.R.CHINA
E-mail address: `fanjishan@njfu.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210093, P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: `fli@nju.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY, SAPPORO 060-0810, JAPAN
E-mail address: `gnaka@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp`